

REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of the application.

The present application contains claims 1-5, 7-9, 14-21, 23-24, 26-28, and 32.

Applicant has cancelled claims 6, 10-13, 22, 25, and 29-31 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 3-5, 14, 17, 20-21, 23, and 26-28 to better describe the invention. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, at page 11, line 30 to page 12, line 12; at page 14, lines 2 to 17.

Amended claim 1 is now directed to an application provision system having, *inter alia*, "a server resident process on the server for controlling the application provision system, and for providing a requested application from the server to the client;" "a database comprising information for the location of files associated with an application that can be installed on the client;" "a platform independent executable program deliverable by the server to the client for execution thereon;" "a browser hosted process on the client resulting from execution of the platform independent executable program on the client;" and "a communication pipe established by the browser hosted process, the communication pipe being bidirectional, and enabling exclusive communication between the server resident process on the server, and the browser hosted process on the client, the browser hosted process accessing resources of the operating system on the client by installing, invoking or reading output from, executable files on the client."

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22, 26, and 30-31 under U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Hamilton et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,464), hereinafter referred to as Hamilton.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection in view of the amendments made herein and the following comments.

Hamilton does not teach or suggest a "communication pipe established by the browser hosted process, the communication pipe being bidirectional, and enabling exclusive communication between the server resident process on the server and the operating system and browser hosted process on the client" and "the browser hosted process accessing resources of the operating system on the client by installing, invoking or reading output from, executable files on the client".

In fact, Hamilton only mentions a "link" 210 between the client 120 and the server 130. In addition, all the communications between the client and the server are going through the object request brokers (ORBs, 160, 200) in the client and server. For example, it is stated at column 4, lines 59 to 63: "In operation, when application program 140 attempts to invoke a method of object 180, application program 140 invokes stubs 150. Stubs 150 marshal the appropriate data for the method invocation and the ORB specific code 160 transmits the data to ORB specific code 200."


Furthermore, there is a clear difference between "stubs" and the "platform independent executable program" as claimed in the present invention. The "stubs" of Hamilton "are used to marshal arguments from application program 230 into marshal buffers 280, call subcontracts 270 to execute remote calls, and to unmarshal any results from a network server" (column 5, lines 14 to 17). The platform independent executable program of the present invention, for example, a Java applet, interacts directly with an operating system resident on the client and communicates with the server resident process through a communication pipe (see page 14 to 15 of the present application).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks.

If any further fees are required by this communication which are not covered by an enclosed check, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33262.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By 
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
Phone: 216-579-1700

Date: July 13, 2006